Minimum Cost Input/Output Design for Large-Scale Linear Structural Systems

Sérgio Pequito [†,‡] Soummya Kar [†] A. Pedro Aguiar [‡,◇]

arXiv:1407.3327v2 [math.OC] 29 Jan 2015

Abstract

In this paper, we provide optimal solutions to two different (but related) input/output design problems involving large-scale linear dynamical systems, where the cost associated to each directly actuated/measured state variable can take different values, but is independent of the labeled input/output variable. Under these conditions, we first aim to determine and characterize the input/output placement that incurs in the minimum cost while ensuring that the resulting placement achieves structural controllability/observability. Further, we address a constrained variant of the above problem, in which we seek to determine the minimum cost placement configuration, among all possible input/output placement configurations that ensures structural controllability/observability, with the lowest number of directly actuated/measured state variables. We show that both problems can be solved efficiently, i.e., using algorithms with polynomial time complexity in the number of the state variables. Finally, we illustrate the obtained results with an example.

Keywords : Linear Structural Systems, I/O Selection, Graph Theory, Computational Complexity

I. Introduction

The problem of control systems design, meeting certain desired specifications, is of fundamental importance. Possible specifications include (but are not restricted to) controllability and observability. These specifications ensure the capability of a dynamical system (such as chemical process plants, refineries, power plants, and airplanes, to name a few) to drive its state toward a specified goal or infer its present state. To achieve these specifications, the selection of where to place the actuators and sensors assumes a critical importance. More often than not, we need to consider the cost per actuator/sensor, that depends on its specific funtionality and/or its

[†] Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213
[‡] Institute for System and Robotics, Instituto Superior Técnico, Technical University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal
[◇] Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal

installation and maintenance cost. The resulting placement cost optimization problem (apparently combinatorial) can be quite non-trivial, and currently applied state-of-the-art methods typically consider relaxations of the optimization problem, brute force approaches or heuristics, see for instance [19], [11], [1], [2], [10].

An additional problem is the fact that the precise numerical values of the system model parameters are generally not available for many large-scale systems of interest. A natural direction is to consider structural systems [7] based reformulations, which we pursue in this work. Representative work in structural systems theory may be found in [13], [28], [27], [16], see also the survey [8] and references therein. The main idea is to reformulate and study an equivalent class of systems for which system-theoretic properties are investigated on the basis of the location of zeros/nonzeros of the state space representation matrices. Properties such as controllability and observability are, in this framework, referred to as *structural controllability*[1] and *structural observability*, respectively.

In this context, consider a given (possibly large-scale) system with autonomous dynamics

$$\dot{x} = Ax, \tag{1}$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the state and A is the $n \times n$ dynamics matrix. Suppose that the sparsity (i.e., location of zeros and nonzeros) pattern of A is available, but the specific numerical values of its nonzero elements are not known. Let $\bar{A} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times n}$ be the binary matrix that represents the structural pattern of A, i.e., it encodes the sparsity pattern of A by assigning 0 to each zero entry of A and 1 otherwise. The two problems addressed in this paper are as follows.

Problem Statement

$\mathcal{P}_1$ Given the structure of the dynamics matrix $\bar{A} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times n}$ and a vector c of size n, where the entry $c_i \geq 0$ denotes the cost of directly actuating the state variable i, determine the

[1]A pair (A, B) is said to be structurally controllable if there exists a pair (A', B') with the same structure as (A, B), i.e., same locations of zeros and nonzeros, such that (A', B') is controllable. By density arguments [27], it can be shown that if a pair (A, B) is structurally controllable, then almost all (with respect to the Lebesgue measure) pairs with the same structure as (A, B) are controllable. In essence, structural controllability is a property of the structure of the pair (A, B) and not of the specific numerical values. A similar definition and characterization holds for structural observability (with obvious modifications).

sparsity of the input matrix $\bar{B}$ that solves the following optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\bar{B}\in\{0,1\}^{n\times n}} \quad & \|\bar{B}\|_c \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (\bar{A},\bar{B}) \text{ structurally controllable} \\ & \|\bar{B}\|_0 \leq \|\bar{B}'\|_0, \text{ for all} \\ & (\bar{A},\bar{B}') \text{ structurally controllable}, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $\|\bar{B}\|_c = c^T\bar{B}\mathbf{1}$, $\|\bar{B}\|_0$ denotes the zero (quasi) norm corresponding to the number of nonzero entries in $\bar{B}$, and $\mathbf{1}$ the vector of ones with size n.

Observe that in $\mathcal{P}_1$ there is a restriction of obtaining a solution with the minimum number of state variables that need to be directly actuated in order to achieve structural controllability. Without such restriction, i.e., by possibly actuating more state variables, we may obtain a lower cost placement achieving structural controllability, which leads to the following related problem.

$\mathcal{P}_2$ Given the structure of the dynamics matrix $\bar{A} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times n}$ and a vector c of size n, where the entry $c_i \geq 0$ denotes the cost of directly actuating the state variable i, determine the sparsity of the input matrix $\bar{B}$ that solves the following optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\bar{B}\in\{0,1\}^{n\times n}} \quad & \|\bar{B}\|_c \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (\bar{A},\bar{B}) \text{ structurally controllable}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Notice that in the above problems, we assume that the cost associated to each directly actuated/measured state variable can take different values, but is independent of the labeled input/output variable. In addition, observe that in $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$, some solutions may comprise at most one nonzero entry in each column; in other words, solutions in which each input actuates at most one state variable. Such inputs are referred to as *dedicated inputs*, and they correspond to columns of the input matrix $\bar{B}$ with exactly one nonzero entry. Additionally, if a solution $\bar{B}^*$ is such that all its nonzero columns consist of exactly one nonzero entry, it is referred to as a *dedicated solution*, otherwise it is referred to as a *non-dedicated solution*. Finally, we notice that a solution to $\mathcal{P}_1$ or $\mathcal{P}_2$ may consist of columns with all zero entries, that can be disregarded when

considering the deployment of the inputs required to actuate the system. Notice that in the worst case scenario, taking the identity matrix as the input matrix we obtain structural controllability, which justifies the dimensions chosen for the solution search space.

Remark 1: The solution procedures for $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ also address the corresponding structural observability output matrix design problem by invoking the duality between observability and controllability in linear time-invariant (LTI) systems [12]. $\diamond$

Recently, the I/O selection problem have received increasing attention in the literature, especially, since the publication of [17]. In [17], the *minimal controllability problem*, i.e., the problem of determining the sparsest input matrix that ensures controllability of a given LTI system, was shown to be NP-hard. Furthermore, in [17] some greedy algorithms ensuring controllability are provided, and in [26] procedures for obtaining optimal solutions in specific cases are presented. Although the minimal controllability problem is NP-hard, in [21], using graph theoretical constructions, the structural version of the minimal controllability problem, or the *minimal structural controllability problem*, was shown to be polynomially solvable. Note, in turn, this implies that for almost all numerical realizations of the dynamic matrix, satisfying a predefined pattern of zeros/nonzeros, the associated minimal controllability problem is polynomially solvable. Alternatively, in [29], [30], [3], [4], [20], [14] the configuration of actuators is sought to ensure certain performance criteria; more precisely, [29], [30], [20], [4] focus on optimizing properties of the controllability Grammian, whereas [3] studies leader selection problems in order to minimize convergence errors experienced by the follower agents, given in terms of the norm of the difference between the follower agents' states and the convex hull of the leader agent states, and [14] aims to identify leaders that are most effective in minimizing the deviation from consensus in the presence of disturbances. In addition, in [3], [29], [30] the submodularity properties of functions of the controllability Grammian are explored, and design algorithms are proposed that achieve feasible placement with certain guarantees on the optimality gap. The I/O selection problem considered in the present paper differs from the aforementioned problems in the following three aspects: first, the selection of the inputs is not restricted to belong to a specific given set of possible inputs, which are referred to as constrained input selection (CIS) problems. Secondly, it contrasts with [29], [30], [3], [20] in the sense that we do not aim to ensure performance in terms of a function of the controllability Grammian, but we aim to

minimize the overall actuation cost, measured in terms of manufacturing/installation/preference costs. Lastly, instead of optimizing a specific (numerical) system instance, we focus on structural design guarantees that hold for almost all (numerical) system instantiations with a specified dynamic coupling structure. The minimum CIS when only the structure is considered, i.e., the problem of determining the minimum collection of inputs in a CIS problem, to ensure structural controllability, has previously been extensively studied, see [5], [8] and references therein. Nevertheless, the minimum CIS problem is shown to be NP-hard [23] in general. In addition, it is not difficult to see that any problem that aims to minimize the cost of a collection of inputs in a CIS problem, where arbitrary (non-zero) actuation costs are considered, is at least as difficult as the minimum CIS, hence, also NP-hard. Notice that, from the computational complexity point of view, this also contrasts with the problems explored in this paper.

On the other hand, the problems presented here are closely related with those presented in [21], where the sparsest (structural) input matrix among all structural input matrices ensuring structural controllability is sought; in particular, the latter corresponds to $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ when the costs are uniform, i.e., each variable incurs in the same (non-zero) cost. In addition, in [21] an algorithm to compute a minimum subset of state variables that need to be actuated to ensure structural controllability of the system is described. However, the techniques developed in [25], [21], despite providing useful insights, are not sufficient to address the problems $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ with non-uniform cost, i.e., when actuating different state variables incur in different costs. More recently, some preliminary results on problems $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ were presented by us in [24] and [22] respectively, by exploiting some intrinsic properties of the class of all minimal subset of state variables that need to be actuated by dedicated inputs to ensure structural controllability. Although [24] and [22] provided polynomial algorithmic solutions to $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$, they incur in higher polynomial complexity (more precisely, $\mathcal{O}(n^{3.5})$) than the ones presented in this paper incurring in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$; furthermore, the solutions presented in the present paper do not require the exploration of the properties of the feasibility space, and reduces the problem to a well known graph-theoretic problem, the weighted maximum matching problem. Very recently, we came across [18], where the problem $\mathcal{P}_1$ is addressed for a specific binary actuation cost structure in which the cost vector is restricted to be of the form $c \in \{0, \infty\}^n$, i.e., corresponding to a subset of state variables that can be actuated with the same finite (zero) cost, and the rest that are *forbidden*, i.e., with an infinite actuation cost. The proposed method in [18] achieves

computational complexity $\mathcal{O}(n^{2.5})$; however, this approach is restricted to the special binary cost structure as described above. Furthermore, it is not likely that algorithms to compute the solution to the problems $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ with a lower complexity than the ones presented in the present paper are attainable for general cost vectors c (using the same framework), since they require the computation of a minimum weighted maximum matching, for which the fastest existing algorithms share a complexity equal to the ones presented here, see [9] for recent advances and literature survey. Consequently, the methodologies presented in this paper are more suitable to address $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ than those in [24] and [22], when dealing with more general cost structures and higher dimensional LTI systems. In addition, we provide a relation between $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ that sheds some light on possible extensions towards less restrictive cost assumptions.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows: we show that we can solve $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ resorting to algorithms with complexity $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$, where n is the dimension of the state space. In addition, these algorithms are obtained while exploring the relation between these two problems, i.e., using some insights from $\mathcal{P}_1$ to solve $\mathcal{P}_2$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section II reviews results from structural systems and its implications on optimal input-output placement in LTI systems with uniform placement cost; furthermore, it explores some graph theorectical concepts required to obtain the main results of this paper. Section III presents the main results of the paper, in particular, a procedure to determine the minimal cost placement of inputs in LTI systems, as formulated in $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$. Section IV illustrates the procedures through an example. Finally, Section V concludes the paper, and presents avenues for future research.

II. Preliminaries and Terminology

The following standard terminology and notions from graph theory can be found, for instance in [21]. Let $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}) = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}})$ be the digraph representation of $\bar{A} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times n}$, to be referred to as the *state digraph*, where the vertex set $\mathcal{X}$ represents the set of state variables (also referred to as state vertices) and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}} = \{(x_i, x_j) : \ \bar{A}_{ji} \neq 0\}$ denotes the set of edges. Similarly, given $\bar{B} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times p}$, we define the digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}) = (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{X}})$, to be referred to as *system digraph*, where $\mathcal{U}$ represents the set of input vertices and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{X}} = \{(u_i, x_j) : \ \bar{B}_{ji} \neq 0\}$. Further, by similarity, we have the *state-slack digraph* given by $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{S}) = (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}})$, where $\mathcal{S}$ represents the set of slack variables (or vertices). In addition, given digraphs $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ and

$\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{S})$, we say that they are *isomorphic* to each other, if there exists a bijective relationship between the vertices and edges of the digraphs that preserves the incidence relation. Finally, since the edges are directed, an edge is said to be an *outgoing edge* from a vertex v if it starts in v, and, similarly, is said to be an *incoming edge* to w if it ends on w.



Fig. 1. In a) an illustrative example of a digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$ is provided, where the SCCs are depicted in the dashed boxes and the non-top linked SCC (only one) labeled by $\mathcal{N}_1^T$. The red edges correspond to the edges in a possible maximum matching M^* of the bipartite graph $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$, presented in b). Moreover, x_2, x_7 are right-unmatched vertices (they do not belong to matching edges) w.r.t. M^* and are depicted by red circles. In fact, x_2 plays *double role*, i.e., is a state variable that also belongs to (the only) non-top linked SCC. Finally, by Theorem 1, we obtain that $\{x_2, x_7\}$ is a feasible dedicated input configuration. Hence, the assignment of two distinct inputs to those state variables ensures structural controllability of the system $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$. Further, it is easy to see that any superset of a feasible dedicated input configuration is also a feasible dedicated input configuration.

In addition, we will use the following graph theoretic notions [6]: A digraph $\mathcal{D}_s = (\mathcal{V}_s, \mathcal{E}_s)$ with $\mathcal{V}_s \subset \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{E}_s \subset \mathcal{E}$ is called a *subgraph* of $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. A sequence of edges $\{(v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3), \cdots, (v_{k-1}, v_k)\}$, in which all the vertices are distinct, is called *an elementary path* from v_1 to v_k. A vertex with an edge to itself (i.e., a *self-loop*), or an elementary path from v_1 to v_k together with an additional edge (v_k, v_1), is called a *cycle*. A digraph $\mathcal{D}$ is said to be strongly connected if there exists a directed path between any two pairs of vertices. A *strongly connected component* (SCC) is a maximal subgraph $\mathcal{D}_s = (\mathcal{V}_s, \mathcal{E}_s)$ of $\mathcal{D}$ such that for every $v, w \in \mathcal{V}_s$ there exists a path from v to w. Notice that the SCCs are uniquely defined for a given digraph; consequently, visualizing each SCC as a virtual node (or supernode), we can generate a *directed acyclic graph* (DAG), in which each node corresponds to a single SCC and there exists a directed edge between two virtual nodes *if and only if* there exists a directed edge connecting vertices within the corresponding SCCs in the original digraph. The DAG associated with $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ can be efficiently generated in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{E}|)$ [6], where $|\mathcal{V}|$ and $|\mathcal{E}|$ denote the number of vertices in $\mathcal{V}$ and the number of edges in $\mathcal{E}$, respectively. In the DAG representation, an SCC (a supernode) that has no incoming edge from any state in a different SCC (supernode) is referred to as a *non-*

top linked SCC, since, by convention, the DAG is graphically represented with edges between the virtual nodes drawn downwards, an example is depicted in Figure 1-a).

For any two vertex sets $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2 \subset \mathcal{V}$, we define the *bipartite graph* $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2})$, as a graph (bipartite), whose vertex set is given by $\mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2$ and the edge set $\mathcal{E}_{S_1,S_2} \subseteq \{(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{E} \ : \ s_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2 \ \}$. Given $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2})$, a matching M corresponds to a subset of edges in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2}$ that do not share vertices, i.e., given edges $e = (s_1, s_2)$ and $e' = (s'_1, s'_2)$ with $s_1, s'_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$ and $s_2, s'_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2$, $e, e' \in M$ only if $s_1 \neq s'_1$ and $s_2 \neq s'_2$. A bipartite graph is, by convention, depicted by a set of vertices $\mathcal{S}_1$ in the left and the other set of vertices $\mathcal{S}_2$ in the right to clearly emphasize the bipartition, an example is depicted in Figure 1-b). The vertices in $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ are *matched vertices* if they belong to an edge in the matching M, otherwise, we designate the vertices as *unmatched vertices*. A maximum matching M^* is a matching M that has the largest number of edges among all possible matchings. It is to be noted that a maximum matching M^* may not be unique. For ease of referencing, keeping in mind the bipartite graphical representation, the term *right-unmatched vertices*, with respect to (w.r.t.) $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2})$ and a matching M (not necessarily maximum), will refer to those vertices in $\mathcal{S}_2$ that do not belong to a matching edge in M, and are denoted by $\mathcal{U}_R(M)$. In addition, we introduce the following notation: given a set of edges $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2}$, we denote by $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2})$ and $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2})$ the collection of vertices corresponding to the set of left and right endpoints of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2}$, i.e., in $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$, respectively.

Now, we present some specific bipartite graphs that are closely related with the digraphs previously introduced. More precisely, we have: (i) the *state bipartite graph* $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}})$ that we often refer to as the bipartite representation of (or associated with, or induced by) the state digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$; (ii) the *system bipartite graph* $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{X}})$ that we often refer to as the bipartite representation of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$; and, similarly to the latter, we have (iii) the *state-slack bipartite graph* $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}})$ that we often refer to as the bipartite representation of the state-slack digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{S})$.

If we associate *weights* (or costs) with the edges in a digraph and bipartite graph, we obtain a *weighted digraph* and *weighted bipartite graph*, respectively. A weighted digraph is represented by the pair digraph-weight given by $(\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}); w)$, where $w : \mathcal{E} \to \mathbb{R}_0^+ \cup \{\infty\}$ is the weight function. Similarly, a weighted bipartite graph is represented by the pair bipartite-weight $(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2}); w)$. Subsequently, we introduce the *minimum weight maximum matching* problem. This problem consists in determining the maximum matching of a weighted bipartite

graph $(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2}); w)$ that incurs the minimum weight-sum of its edges; in other words, determining the maximum matching M^c such that

$$M^c = \arg\min_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \in M} w(e),$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ is the set of all maximum matchings of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2})$. This problem can be efficiently solved using, for instance, the Hungarian algorithm [15], with computational complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\max\{|\mathcal{S}_1|, |\mathcal{S}_2|\}^3)$.

We will also require the following general results on structural control design from [21] (see also [25]). We define a *feasible dedicated input configuration* to be a collection of state variables to which by assigning dedicated inputs we can ensure structural controllability of the system. Consequently, a minimal feasible dedicated input configuration is the minimal subset of state variables to which we need to assign dedicated inputs to ensure structural controllability. Further, the feasible dedicated input configurations can be characterized as follows.

Theorem 1 (Theorem 3 in [21]): Let $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}) = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}})$ denote the system digraph and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}) \equiv \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}})$ the associated state bipartite graph. Let $\mathcal{S}_u \subset \mathcal{X}$, then the following statements are equivalent:

1) The set $\mathcal{S}_u$ is a feasible dedicated input configuration;
2) There exists a subset $\mathcal{U}_R(M^*) \subset \mathcal{S}_u$ corresponding to the set of right-unmatched vertices of some maximum matching M^* of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$, and a subset $\mathcal{A}_u \subset \mathcal{S}_u$ comprising one state variable from each non-top linked SCC of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$. $\diamond$

Observe that a state variable can be simultaneously in $\mathcal{U}_R(M^*)$ and $\mathcal{A}_u$, even if these sets correspond to those of a minimal feasible dedicated input configuration; thus, motivating us to refer to those variables as playing a *double role*, since they contribute to both the conditions in Theorem 1. To illustrate Theorem 1, we provide an example in Figure 1.

Remark 2: In [21], [25] general results were given on structural input selection, in particular on non-dedicated structural input design, i.e., in which the structural input matrix $\bar{B}$ may possess multiple nonzero entries in each column. To ease the presentation, we denote by m the number of right-unmatched vertices in any maximum matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ and by β the number of non-top linked SCCs in $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$. The following characterization of structural controllability was obtained

in [21,22] (see Theorem 8 in [21]): a pair $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ is structurally controllable if and only if there exists a maximum matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ with a set of right-unmatched vertices $\mathcal{U}_R$, such that, $\bar{B}$ has (at least) m nonzero entries, one in each of the rows corresponding to the different state variables in $\mathcal{U}_R$ and located at different columns, and (at least) β nonzero entries, each of which belongs to a row (state variable) corresponding to a distinct non-top linked SCC and located in arbitrary columns. $\diamond$

Notice that as a direct consequence of Remark 2, we obtain that any $\bar{B}$, such that $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ is structurally controllable, must have at least m distinct nonzero columns (or m distinct control inputs).

III. Main Results

Despite the fact that problems $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ seem to be highly combinatorial, hereafter we show that they can be solved using polynomial complexity (in the dimension of the state space) algorithms. To obtain those results, we first present some intermediate results: (i) we characterize the matchings that the bipartite graphs used in the sequel can have (Lemma 1 and Lemma 2), and (ii) we characterize the minimum weight maximum matchings that a weighted bipartite graph can have, upon a specific cost structure to be used to solve and characterize the solutions to $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$, see Lemma 3 and Lemma 4. Subsequently, we initially address $\mathcal{P}_1$ by reducing it to a minimum weight maximum matching problem, and present the solution in Algorithm 1. Then, motivated by the solution to $\mathcal{P}_1$, we provide a reduction of $\mathcal{P}_2$ to another minimum weight maximum matching problem, described in Algorithm 2. The correctness and computational complexity proofs of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 are presented in Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, respectively.

A. Intermediate Results

Let $\bar{S}$ be a $n \times q$ structural (binary) matrix, and denote by $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S})$ the state-slack bipartite graph associated with the digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{S})$. Note, by construction, the state-slack digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{S})$ consists of $n + q$ vertices, where the q additional vertices (in comparison with the state digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$) correspond to the *slack* variables, introduced by $\bar{S}$. Further, by construction, the slack variables only have outgoing edges (associated with the nonzero entries of $\bar{S}$) to the state variables in $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{S})$; in other words, there are no incoming edges into the slack variables. We start by relating maximum matchings of the two bipartite graphs $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S})$, where, note that,

the former is a subgraph of the latter. This will also help in obtaining better insight and better understanding of the properties of the maximum matchings of the different bipartite graphs.

Lemma 1: Let $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S})=(\mathcal{X}\cup\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X},\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}\cup\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}})$ be the state-slack bipartite graph, $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})=\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X},\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{S})=\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X},\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}})$. The following statements hold:

1) If $M_{\bar{A}}$ and $M_{\bar{S}}$ are matchings of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{S})$ respectively, and $\mathcal{R}(M_{\bar{A}})\cap\mathcal{R}(M_{\bar{S}})=\emptyset$, then $M_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}=M_{\bar{S}}\cup M_{\bar{A}}$ is a matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S})=(\mathcal{X}\cup\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X},\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}\cup\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}})$.
2) If $M_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ is a matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S})=(\mathcal{X}\cup\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X},\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}\cup\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}})$, then $M_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}=M_{\bar{S}}\cup M_{\bar{A}}$, where $M_{\bar{A}}=M_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}\cap\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}$ and $M_{\bar{S}}=M_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}\cap\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}}$ are (disjoint) matchings of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{S})$, respectively.

In particular, $\mathcal{R}(M_{\bar{S}})\subset\mathcal{U}_R(M_{\bar{A}})$, where $\mathcal{U}_R(M_{\bar{A}})$ is the set of right-unmatched vertices associated with the matching $M_{\bar{A}}$.

$\diamond$

Proof: The proof of (1) follows by noticing that, by construction of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S})$, we have $\mathcal{L}(M_{\bar{A}})\cap\mathcal{L}(M_{\bar{S}})=\emptyset$, and by assumption $\mathcal{R}(M_{\bar{A}})\cap\mathcal{R}(M_{\bar{S}})=\emptyset$, which implies that $M_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}=M_{\bar{S}}\cup M_{\bar{A}}$ has no edge with common end-points; in other words, it is a matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S})=(\mathcal{X}\cup\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X},\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}\cup\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}})$, by definition of matching.

On the other hand, the proof of (2) follows by noticing that the edges in $M_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ belong to either $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}$ or $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}}$ and noticing that $M_{\bar{A}}$ and $M_{\bar{S}}$ have no common endpoints since $M_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ is a matching. Subsequently, it is easy to see that $M_{\bar{A}}$ and $M_{\bar{S}}$ are matchings of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{S})$, respectively. ■

Subsequently, from Lemma 1, we can obtain the following result characterizing the maximum matchings of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S})$.

Lemma 2: Let $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S})=(\mathcal{X}\cup\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X},\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}\cup\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}})$ be the state-slack bipartite graph. If $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ is a maximum matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S})=(\mathcal{X}\cup\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X},\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}\cup\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}})$, then $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}=M_{\bar{S}}\cup M_{\bar{A}}$, where $M_{\bar{A}}=M_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}\cap\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}$ and $M_{\bar{S}}=M_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}\cap\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}}$ are (disjoint) matchings of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{S})$, respectively, and $M_{\bar{S}}$ contains the largest collection of edges incoming into a set of right-unmatched vertices of some maximum matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$. In particular, $\mathcal{R}(M_{\bar{S}})\subset\mathcal{U}_R(M_{\bar{A}})$, where $\mathcal{U}_R(M_{\bar{A}})$ is the set of right-unmatched vertices associated with the (possibly not maximum) matching $M_{\bar{A}}$. $\diamond$

Proof: From Lemma 1-(2), we obtain that $M_{\bar{A}}$ and $M_{\bar{S}}$ are (disjoint) matchings of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{S})$, respectively. Now, recall that any set of right-unmatched vertices $\mathcal{U}_R$ associated with a matching of a bipartite graph comprises a set of right-unmatched vertices $\mathcal{U}_R^*$ associated with a maximum matching of that bipartite graph [21]. Next, given that $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ is a maximum matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S})$, it follows that $\mathcal{U}_R(M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}})$ comprises the lowest possible number of right-unmatched vertices. Now, to establish that $M_{\bar{S}}$ contains the largest collection of edges incoming into a set of right-unmatched vertices of a maximum matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$, suppose by contradiction, that this is not the case. Then, there exists at least one more right-unmatched vertex in the set of right-unmatched vertices associated with a matching M' of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S})$ than in the set of right-unmatched vertices associated with a maximum matching $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$; hence, M' cannot be a maximum matching. ■



Fig. 2. In a) we have a state digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$ and its associated state bipartite graph $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$, where the edges in the maximum matching of the former are depicted in red. By adding a slack variable s_1 (corresponding to having the slack matrix equal to the canonical vector e_1 with first entry equal to 1 and zero elsewhere) depicted by the green vertex, and associating weights with the edges of the extended digraph, we obtain $(\mathcal{D}(\bar{A},\bar{S}\equiv e_1);w_1)$ and $(\mathcal{D}(\bar{A},\bar{S}\equiv e_1);w_2)$ depicted in b) and c), respectively. The new digraph has two possible maximum matchings (the associated bipartite graph), with edges that are depicted in red, shown in b) and c). In addition, if we consider the minimum weight maximum matching, then b) corresponds to the case where the weight of the edge from the slack variable to x_1 is larger than the weight of the edge from x_3 to x_1; whereas, c) provides the alternative scenario, where edges outgoing from slack variables are preferred to those between state variables.

We now extend the results of Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 to weighted bipartite graphs. Consequently, when solving the minimum weight maximum matching, the maximum matching (characterized in Lemma 2) obtained depends on the weights assigned. For example, as depicted in Figure 2-c), if the weights of the edges between state variables in the bipartite graph are larger than the weight of the edge outgoing from the slack variable, then the edge outgoing from the slack variable belongs to the minimum weight maximum matching of the weighted state-

slack bipartite graph. Alternatively, if the weight of the edge outgoing from the slack variable is larger than the weights of the edges between state variables, then the minimum weight maximum matching of the weighted state-slack bipartite graph comprises the largest set of edges between state variables; in particular, in Figure 2-b) a maximum matching consists of edges between state variables only. The same reasoning can be readily applied if several slack variables are considered, as formally stated next.

Lemma 3: Let $\bar{A} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times n}$ and $\bar{S} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times p}$ with $p \leq n$. Consider the weighted state-slack bipartite graph $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S});w)$, where $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S}) = \big(\mathcal{X}\cup\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X},\mathcal{E}\equiv(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}\cup\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}})\big)$, and $w:\mathcal{E}\rightarrow\mathbb{R}_0^+\cup\{\infty\}$ such that $w(e_{\bar{S}}) > w(e_{\bar{A}}) = c_{\bar{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^+$, with $e_{\bar{S}} \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}}$ and $e_{\bar{A}} \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}$. A minimum weighted maximum matching $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ of $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S});w)$ is given by

$$M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}} = M^*_{\bar{A}} \cup \mathcal{E}^*_{\bar{S}},$$

where $\mathcal{E}^*_{\bar{S}}$ consists in the largest collection of edges incoming into a set of right-unmatched vertices associated with a maximum matching $M^*_{\bar{A}}$ of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ and such that $\mathcal{E}^*_{\bar{S}}$ incurs in the lowest weight-sum among all possible collection of edges incoming into a set of right-unmatched vertices associated with a maximum matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$. $\diamond$

Proof: From Lemma 2 we have that any maximum matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S})$ comprises a set $\mathcal{E}^*_{\bar{S}} \subset \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}}$ that consists in the largest collection of edges incoming into a set of right-unmatched vertices associated with a maximum matching $M^*_{\bar{A}}$ of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$. In addition, since the weights of the edges in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}$ are uniform and less than the weights of the edges in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}}$, it follows that the edges from $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}$ are preferred over the edges in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}}$ as far as the maximum matching $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ is concerned; consequently, the edges from $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}$ in $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ are those that belong to a maximum matching $M^*_{\bar{A}}$ of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$. By noticing that the weight-sum of all matchings of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ incur in the same cost, and a set $\mathcal{E}^*_{\bar{S}}$ with the characteristics previously described must belong to the maximum matching $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ of $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S});w)$, the minimum cost of $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ is achieved by considering the set $\mathcal{E}^*_{\bar{S}}$ incurring in the lowest weight-sum, among all possible collection of edges incoming into a set of right-unmatched vertices associated with a maximum matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$. ■

By reversing the inequality between the weights of the edges between state variables and those outgoing from the slack variables, we obtain the following result.

Lemma 4: Let $\bar{A} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times n}$ and $\bar{S} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times p}$ with $p \leq n$. Consider the weighted state-slack bipartite graph $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S});w)$, where $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S}) = \big(\mathcal{X}\cup\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X},\mathcal{E} \equiv (\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}\cup\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}})\big)$, and $w : \mathcal{E} \to \mathbb{R}_0^+ \cup \{\infty\}$ such that $w(e_{\bar{S}}) < w(e_{\bar{A}}) = c_{\bar{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^+$, with $e_{\bar{S}} \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}}$ and $e_{\bar{A}} \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}$. A minimum weighted maximum matching $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ of $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S});w)$ is given by

$$M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}} = M^*_{\bar{S}} \cup M_{\bar{A}},$$

where $M^*_{\bar{S}}$ and $M_{\bar{A}}$ are as given in Lemma 2, and $M^*_{\bar{S}}$ is a maximum matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{S}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X},\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}})$ whose edges incur in the lowest weight-sum among all possible maximum matchings of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{S})$. $\diamond$

Proof: The proof follows a similar reasoning to that in the proof of Lemma 2. In particular, notice that $M^*_{\bar{S}}$ is a maximum matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{S})$ because an arbitrary weight-sum of the edges of a maximum matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{S})$ is smaller than that of a collection of edges of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A},\bar{S})$ with the same size containing edges from $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}$, and secondly it consists in the largest collection of edges incoming into a set of right-unmatched vertices associated with a maximum matching $M^*_{\bar{A}}$ of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ ■

B. Solution to $\mathcal{P}_1$

Now, we present the reduction of $\mathcal{P}_1$ to a minimum weight maximum matching problem. Intuitively, given the system's dynamical structure and its digraph representation, we consider an extended digraph with as many slack variables as the minimum number of state variables required to obtain a feasible dedicated input configuration (recall Remark 2). These slack variables will indicate which state variables should be considered to achieve a feasible dedicated input configuration. Towards this goal, outgoing edges from the slack variables into the state variables (to be considered to the feasible dedicated input configuration) are judiciously chosen such that a minimum weight maximum matching containing these edges exists; hence, corresponding to the feasible dedicated input configuration that incurs in minimum cost. The systematic reduction of $\mathcal{P}_1$ to a minimum weight maximum matching, is presented in Algorithm 1. Although in Algorithm 1 we determine a solution $\bar{B}$ that is dedicated, in Remark 3 (using Remark 2), we can characterize all possible solutions to $\mathcal{P}_1$. Next, we present the proof of correctness of Algorithm 1 and its complexity.

Algorithm 1 Solution to $\mathcal{P}_1$

Input: The structural $n \times n$ system matrix $\bar{A}$, and the vector c of size n comprising the cost of actuating each state variable.
Output: A solution $\bar{B}$ to $\mathcal{P}_1$ comprising dedicated inputs.
1. Determine the minimum number p of dedicated inputs required to ensure structural controllability [21].
2. Let $\mathcal{N}_j^T$, with $j = 1, \cdots, \beta$, denote the non-top linked SCCs of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$. Let $c_{\max}$ be the maximum real value (i.e., not considering ∞) in c, and consider p slack variables, where each slack variable $k = 1, \ldots, \beta$ has outgoing edges to all the state variables in the k-th non-top linked SCC $\mathcal{N}_k^T$, whereas, for the remaining $p - \beta$ slack variables have outgoing edges to all state variables, i.e.,

$$\bar{S} = \begin{bmatrix} | & | & & | \\ \bar{s}_1 & \bar{s}_2 & \cdots & \bar{s}_p \\ | & | & & | \end{bmatrix},$$

where the ith entry of $\bar{s}_k$ is given by $[\bar{s}_k]_i = 1$ if $x_i \in \mathcal{N}^k$ with $k = 1, \ldots, \beta$, and $[\bar{s}_k]_i = 0$ otherwise; further, for $k = \beta + 1, \ldots, p$ we have $[\bar{s}_k]_i = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Now, consider $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S}); w)$ where w is given as follows:

$$w(e) = \begin{cases} c_{\max} + 1, & e \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}, \\ c_i, & e \equiv (s_j, x_i) \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}},\ j = 1, \ldots, p, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

3. Determine the minimum weight maximum matching M^* associated with the bipartite graph $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S}); w)$.
4. Assign dedicated inputs to the state variables in $\Theta = \{x \in \mathcal{X} :\ (s_k, x) \in M^*,\ k = 1, \cdots, p\}$. In other words, given the indices of the state variables in Θ, denoted by $\mathcal{J} \subset \{1, \cdots, n\}$, set $\bar{B} = \mathbb{I}_n^{\mathcal{J}}$, where $\mathbb{I}_n^{\mathcal{J}}$ is a submatrix of the $n \times n$ identity matrix consisting of the columns with indices in $\mathcal{J}$. If $|\mathcal{J}| = p$ and the weight-sum of M^* is finite, then $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ is structurally controllable, and a solution to $\mathcal{P}_1$ is obtained; otherwise, the problem is infeasible, i.e., there is no feasible $\bar{B}$ (with finite cost) such that $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ is structurally controllable.

Theorem 2: Algorithm 1 is correct, i.e., it provides a solution to $\mathcal{P}_1$ (as long as the set of feasible $\bar{B}$'s is non-empty). Moreover, its computational complexity is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$. $\diamond$

Proof: First, we notice that a solution obtained using Algorithm 1 is feasible, i.e., leads to $\bar{B} = \mathbb{I}_n^{\mathcal{J}}$ such that $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ is structurally controllable, if $|\mathcal{J}| = p$ and the weight-sum of $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{B}}$ is finite. More precisely, let $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$ be the state digraph comprising β non-top linked SCCs. Further, it is possible to (efficiently) determine a minimal feasible dedicated input configuration [21], and we denote its size by p. By recalling Theorem 1, we have at least β state variables in different non-top linked SCCs and the remaining $p - \beta$ state variables correspond to right-unmatched vertices in the set of right-unmatched vertices associated with a maximum matching of the state

bipartite graph $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ and do not belong to the non-top linked SCCs. Consequently, we consider an augmented digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{S})$, with $\bar{S} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times p}$, with p slack variables, that will indicate the variables to be considered for obtaining a minimal feasible dedicated input configuration. Further, we construct $\bar{S}$ to be as follows: each of the β slack variables are such that slack variable k, with $k = 1, \ldots, \beta$, has only outgoing edges to all the state variables in the non-top linked SCC k, and the remaining the remaining $p - \beta$ slack variables have edges to all state variables. From Lemma 2 and the knowledge that a feasible dedicated input configuration with p state variables exists, we can argue that a maximum matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S})$ contains edges outgoing from slack variables and ending in all right-unmatched vertices with respect to a maximum matching of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$. Furthermore, there exists a maximum matching $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S})$, where all slack variables belong to matching edges in $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$. In the former case, due to the proposed construction, there is at least one edge from a slack variable to each non-top linked SCC; hence, by Theorem 1, the collection of the state variables, where the edges with origin in slack variables belonging to $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ end, is a feasible dedicated input configuration; such a collection is also minimal since it has exactly p state variables – the size of a minimal feasible dedicated input configuration. Therefore, we aim to determine such a matching, which will be accomplished by considering a minimum weight maximum matching problem. More precisely, we associate weights with the edges of the proposed digraph: weights of the edges outgoing from the slack variables are set to be equal to the cost of actuating the state variables (specified by the cost vector c) corresponding to the end points of the edges, whereas, the remaining edges are assigned large enough (otherwise arbitrary) weights, in particular, higher than those of the edges outgoing from the slack variables. Therefore, taking $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S}); w)$ to be the weighted version of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S})$ with the weight function as previously described, by invoking Lemma 4, there exists a maximum matching $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S})$, where each edge with origin in slack variables belonging to $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ indicates which state variables should be actuated, and such collection is a feasible dedicated input configuration if it is of size p and the sum of the weights of the edges in $M^*_{\bar{A},\bar{S}}$ is finite. In other words, an infinite cost would correspond to the case where no feasible dedicated input configuration exists, i.e., no finite cost input matrix $\bar{B}$ can make the system structurally controllable. In summary, we obtain a minimal feasible dedicated input configuration with the lowest cost, which corresponds to a (dedicated) solution to $\mathcal{P}_1$. In Figure 3, we present an illustrative example, where we present the construction for a digraph consisting of a single (i.e., $\beta = 1$) non-top linked SCC and the size

of the minimum feasible dedicated configuration is $p = 2$.

Now, to conclude that $\bar{B}$ obtained by Algorithm 1 incurs in the minimum cost, suppose by contradiction that this is not the case. This implies that, there exists another feasible $\bar{B}'$ leading to a smaller cost. If $\bar{B}'$ has multiple nonzeros in the same column, given Remark 2, there exists $\bar{B}''$ with the same cost as $\bar{B}'$ and with at most one nonzero entry in each column such that $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}'')$ is structurally controllable. Consequently, by letting $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}'') = (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{X}})$ and $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{S})$ to be isomorphic, and considering the weight function w as in Algorithm 1, it follows by Lemma 4 that there exists a maximum matching M'' of $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S}) = (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}}); w)$ containing $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}}$. Nevertheless, this is a contradiction since it implies there exists a maximum matching M'' incurring in a lower cost than M^* obtained using, for instance, the Hungarian algorithm [15], and used to construct $\bar{B}$.

Finally, the computational complexity follows from noticing that Step 1 has complexity $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ [21]. Step 2 can be computed using linear complexity algorithms. In Step 3, the Hungarian algorithm is used on the $n \times (n + p)$ matrix obtained at the end of Step 2, and incurs in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ complexity. Finally, Step 4 consists of a for-loop operation which has linear complexity. Hence, summing up the different complexities, the result follows. ■

Remark 3: Now, consider $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}) = (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{X}}), w')$ where $\bar{B}$ is as obtained from Algorithm 1 and w' is given as follows:

$$w'(e) = \begin{cases} 1, & e \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}, \\ 2, & e \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{X}}, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore, considering $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}); w)$ and using Lemma 3, a minimum weight maximum matching comprises the edges from $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{X}}$ with end-points in the state variables that belong to the set of right-unmatched vertices $\mathcal{U}_R(M^*_{\bar{A}})$ associated with a maximum matching $M^*_{\bar{A}}$ of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$. Consequently, from Remark 2 and the dedicated solution obtained with Algorithm 1, we can further obtain a non-dedicated solution to $\mathcal{P}_1$; more precisely, one requires m distinct inputs, where m is the number of right-unmatched vertices $\mathcal{U}_R(M^*_{\bar{A}})$, assigned to those state variables in $\mathcal{U}_R(M^*_{\bar{A}})$ and some input (potentially the same) must be assigned to the remaining state variables required to ensure structural controllability (identified by the dedicated solution). ◇

C. Solution to $\mathcal{P}_2$

Next, we present the reduction of $\mathcal{P}_2$ to a minimum weight maximum matching problem, similar to the reduction presented in the previous subsection. Nevertheless, because of the (potential) double role of the state variables in a minimal feasible input configuration (i.e., state variables in a non-top linked SCC and right-unmatched vertices), we may be able to further reduce the cost by considering two state variables instead of one playing a double role used in the construction of a minimal feasible dedicated input configuration (associated with a solution to $\mathcal{P}_1$). The aforementioned reduction is described in detail in Algorithm 2 that provides a dedicated solution. Nevertheless, a general non-dedicated solution to $\mathcal{P}_2$ is characterized using Remark 2 and Remark 3. The correctness and computational complexity of Algorithm 2 is presented next.

Theorem 3: Algorithm 2 is correct, i.e., it provides a solution to $\mathcal{P}_2$ (as long as the set of feasible $\bar{B}$'s is non-empty). Moreover, its computational complexity is of $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$. $\diamond$

Proof: To establish the feasibility of the solution, we first notice that no more than two state variables are required to substitute one state variable with double role to ensure structural controllability, since additional state variables increase the cost unnecessarily. The reduction proposed is similar to that which reduces $\mathcal{P}_1$ to a minimum weighted maximum matching, but we need to consider new edges from the slack variables with outgoing edges only to the state variables in a single SCC (and used to ensure the existence of a state variable in each non-top linked SCC) to the remaining state variables. The weight of these new edges consists of the cost of a state variable in the corresponding non-top linked SCC and incurring in the lowest cost, plus the cost of the state variable where the edge ends on. Therefore, if such an edge is selected in the minimum weight maximum matching of $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S}); w)$, it means that it is cheaper to actuate two state variables than actuating one state variable with double role. In summary, the edges selected in the minimum weight maximum matching contain sufficient information about the state variable(s) to which dedicated inputs need to be assigned to to establish structural controllability, as in Theorem 1. Furthermore, this choice of state variables minimizes the cost, which implies a solution to $\mathcal{P}_2$.

To prove that the input matrix $\bar{B}$ obtained in Algorithm 2 is a solution to $\mathcal{P}_2$, suppose by contradiction that there exist another feasible $\bar{B}'$ that incurs in lower cost. By similar arguments as used in the proof of Theorem 2, there exists a $n \times p$ matrix $\bar{B}''$ with at most one non-zero

Algorithm 2 Solution to $\mathcal{P}_2$

Input: The structural $n \times n$ system matrix $\bar{A}$, and the vector c of size n comprising the cost of actuating each state variable.
Output: A solution $\bar{B}$ to $\mathcal{P}_2$ comprising dedicated inputs.
1. Determine the minimum number p of dedicated inputs required to ensure structural controllability [21].
2. Let $\mathcal{N}_j^T$, with $j = 1, \cdots, \beta$, denote the non-top linked SCCs of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$. Additionally, let $c_{\max}$ be the maximum real value (i.e., not considering ∞) in c, and $c_{\min}^k$ corresponds to the minimum cost associated with the state variables in $\mathcal{N}_k^T$. In addition, consider p slack variables, where each slack variable has outgoing edges to all the state variables.
Now, consider $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S}); \tilde{w})$ where $\tilde{w}$ is given as follows:

$$\tilde{w}(e) = \begin{cases} c_{\max}+1, & e \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}, \\ c_i, & e \equiv (s_k, x_i) \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}} \text{ and } x_i \in \mathcal{N}^k, \\ & k = 1, \ldots, \beta, \\ c_i + c_{\min}^k, & e \equiv (s_k, x_i) \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}} \text{ and } x_i \notin \mathcal{N}^k, \\ & k = 1, \ldots, \beta, \\ c_i, & e \equiv (s_k, x_i) \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X}},\ k = \beta+1, \ldots, p, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

3. Determine the minimum weight maximum matching M^* associated with the bipartite graph $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S}); \tilde{w})$.
4. Let $M^* = \{(s_k, x_{\sigma(k)}) : k = 1, \cdots, p\}$ where $\sigma(.)$ is a permutation of the state variables indices. Assign dedicated inputs to the state variables in Θ', given as follows

$$\Theta' = \bigcup_{k=1,\ldots,p} \Omega_k,$$

where

$$\Omega_k = \begin{cases} \{x_{\sigma(k)}\}, \text{ if } x_{\sigma(k)} \in \mathcal{N}_k^T, \\ \{x_{\sigma(k)}, x_{min}^k\}, \text{ if } x_{\sigma(k)} \notin \mathcal{N}_k^T \end{cases}$$

with x_{min}^k a state variable in $\mathcal{N}_k^T$ with the minimum cost. In other words, given the indices of the state variables in Θ', denoted by $\mathcal{J}' \subset \{1, \cdots, n\}$, set $\bar{B} = \mathbb{I}_n^{\mathcal{J}'}$, where $\mathbb{I}_n^{\mathcal{J}'}$ is a submatrix of the $n \times n$ identity matrix consisting of the columns with indices in $\mathcal{J}'$. If the weight-sum of M^* is finite, then $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ is structurally controllable; and a solution to $\mathcal{P}_2$ is obtained; otherwise, the problem is infeasible, i.e., there is no feasible $\bar{B}$ (with finite cost) such that $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ is structurally controllable.

entry in each column and incurring in the same cost as $\bar{B}'$. Consequently, p'' (dedicated) inputs are assigned to either right-unmatched vertices associated with a maximum matching of the state bipartite graph or state variables in a non-top linked SCC. Let us denote by p_r'' the number of right-unmatched vertices and p_n'' the number of state variables in the non-top linked SCCs that are not right-unmatched vertices, where it is easy to see that $p_r'' + p_n'' = p''$. Now, consider

the construction of $\tilde{w}$ in Algorithm 2, we have that the p'' edges selected can correspond to either one of the following: i) an edge with cost c_i which corresponds to an edge ending in one of the p''_r state variables; or ii) an edge with the cost $c_i + c^k_{\min}$ which corresponds to an edge ending in one of the p''_r state variables and another edge ending in one of the p''_n state variables. Nevertheless, these costs have to sum to the lowest cost, which corresponds to the solution of a minimum weight maximum matching matching determined, for instance, using the Hungarian algorithm [15]. Consequently, we obtain a contradiction since $\bar{B}$ was constructed using a minimum weight maximum matching with the same weight function, which implies that it has to incur in the same cost.

The complexity can be obtained in a similar fashion as in the proof of Theorem 2. ■

Remark 4: Reproducing the steps explained in Remark 3, non-dedicated input matrices that are solution to $\mathcal{P}_2$ can be determined from the dedicated solutions to $\mathcal{P}_2$ computed by Algorithm 2. ◇

IV. Illustrative Example

Consider the examples in Figure 3 and Figure 4, in which the manipulating costs for each state variable are given by:

$$c_I = [50 \ \infty \ 10 \ 10 \ 1 \ 10 \ 20].$$

The solutions to $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ are now presented, resorting to Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2. Steps 2-3 from Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 are depicted in Figure 3 and Figure 4, respectively.

We start by describing the solution to $\mathcal{P}_1$. As illustrated in Figure 1, the minimum number of dedicated inputs required to ensure structural controllability is $p = 2$. Consequently, by Algorithm 1, two slack variables, denoted by s_1, s_2, are introduced. From each slack variable, new edges to the state variables are introduced to obtain the bipartite graph $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S}); w)$ as described in Algorithm 1; from s_1 only edges to the state variables in $\mathcal{N}^T_1$ are introduced with weights equal to the cost of actuating the respective variables, although only the edges with finite weight are depicted in Figure 3, whereas from s_2 edges to all state variables are introduced. The solution of Step 3 in Algorithm 1 is given by M^*, and depicted by the red edges in Figure 3-b). The red vertices correspond to the right-unmatched vertices associated with the maximum matching of the state bipartite graph, to which dedicated inputs are assigned in Step 4

of Algorithm 1. Notice that x_1 is a variable with double role, i.e., besides being a right-unmatched vertex, it is also a variable in a non-top linked SCC. The total cost of this assignment is equal to the sum of the costs of actuating x_1 and x_6, summing up to 60.

We now show that, by considering a scenario where more variables can be manipulated, we can achieve a lower cost for the presented example. Similarly to the previous example, we have two slack variables, from which edges are created to each of the state variables. In contrast to the previous example, the edges from s_1 also include the variables not in $\mathcal{N}_1^T$ (depicted by blue edges in Figure 4) with weights equal to the cost of actuating the state variable they end in plus the minimum cost of actuating a state variable in $\mathcal{N}_1^T$, i.e., x_3, with cost 10. The minimum weight maximum matching of $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S}); w')$ is given by M' and depicted by red edges in Figure 4-b). Again, the red vertices represent the right-unmatched vertices with respect to a maximum matching of the state bipartite graph, to which dedicated inputs are assigned in Step 4 of Algorithm 2. Additionally, since one of the edges in blue belongs to M', in this case departing from s_1, a dedicated input must be assigned to a state variable from $\mathcal{N}_1^T$ with the minimum cost, i.e., x_3. More precisely, a possible solutions consists in assigning dedicated inputs to the state variables x_3, x_4, x_6, incurring in a total cost of 30.



Fig. 3. An illustrative example of a digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$, where the SCCs are inscribed in the dashed boxes and the non-top linked SCC labeled by $\mathcal{N}_1^T$. The edges' costs are depicted by green labels, the edges that are not depicted have ∞ cost, and the edges between state variables have cost equal to 51. The red edges correspond to the edges in a possible maximum matching M of the bipartite graph $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S}); w)$. The red vertices represent the right-unmatched vertices with respect to a matching M associated with $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$. In a) the reduction presented in Step 2 of Algorithm 1 is illustrated, where as many slack variables as the minimum number of dedicated inputs required to ensure structural controllability are considered; and b) the red edges represent the edges associated with a maximum matching associated with $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S}); w)$.



Fig. 4. An illustrative example of a digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$, where the SCCs are comprised in the dashed boxes and the non-top linked SCC labeled by $\mathcal{N}_1^T$. The edges' costs are depicted by green labels, the edges that are not depicted have ∞ cost, and the edges between state variables have cost equal to 51. The red edges correspond to the edges in a possible maximum matching M of the bipartite graph $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S}); w')$. The red vertices represent the right-unmatched vertices with respect to a matching M associated with $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$. Additionally, the edges depicted in blue correspond to the ones with weights consisting in the sum of the minimum cost associated with a state variable in a non-top linked SCC and the cost of the variable in which the edge ends. In a) the reduction presented in Step 2 of Algorithm 2 is illustrated, where as many slack variables as the minimum number of dedicated inputs required to ensure structural controllability are considered; and b) the red edges represent the edges in a maximum matching associated with $(\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}, \bar{S}); w')$.

V. Conclusions and Further Research

In this paper, we provided a systematic method with polynomial complexity (in the number of the state variables) in order to obtain minimal cost placements of actuators ensuring structural controllability of a given LTI system. The proposed solutions holds under arbitrary non-homogeneous positive assignment costs for the manipulation of the state variables. By duality, the results extend to the corresponding structural observability output design under cost constraints. The non-homogeneity of the allocation cost makes the framework particularly applicable to input (output) topology design in large-scale dynamic infrastructures, such as power systems, which consist of a large number of heterogeneous dynamic components with varying overheads for controller (sensor) placement and operation. To the best of our knowledge, relaxing any of these constraints would lead to a strictly combinatorial problem for which no polynomial algorithms are expected to exist. Consequently, future research may focus on the development of approximation algorithms under relaxed cost assumptions. Towards this goal, some of the techniques and insights presented in this paper may be useful.

REFERENCES

[1] D. W. Begg and X. Liu. On simultaneous optimization of smart structures - part II: Algorithms and examples. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 184(1):25 – 37, 2000.

[2] D. J. Chmielewski, J.-K. Peng, and A. M. Manthanwar. Convex methods in actuator placement. In *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, volume 6, pages 4309 – 4314 vol.6, 2002.

[3] A. Clark, B. Alomair, L. Bushnell, and R. Poovendran. Minimizing convergence error in multi-agent systems via leader selection: A supermodular optimization approach. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59(6):1480–1494, June 2014.

[4] A. Clark and R. Poovendran. A submodular optimization framework for leader selection in linear multi-agent systems. In *50th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference (CDC-ECC)*, pages 3614–3621, Dec 2011.

[5] C. Commault and J.-M. Dion. Input addition and leader selection for the controllability of graph-based systems. *Automatica*, 49(11):3322–3328, 2013.

[6] T. H. Cormen, C. Stein, R. L. Rivest, and C. E. Leiserson. *Introduction to Algorithms*. McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2nd edition, 2001.

[7] J.-M. Dion, C. Commault, and J. V. der Woude. Characterization of generic properties of linear structured systems for efficient computations. *Kybernetika*, 38:503–520, 2002.

[8] J.-M. Dion, C. Commault, and J. V. der Woude. Generic properties and control of linear structured systems: a survey. *Automatica*, pages 1125–1144, 2003.

[9] R. Duan and S. Pettie. Linear-time approximation for maximum weight matching. *J. ACM*, 61(1):1:1–1:23, January 2014.

[10] F. Fahroo and M. A. Demetriou. Optimal actuator/sensor location for active noise regulator and tracking control problems. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 114(1):137 – 158, 2000.

[11] M. I. Frecker. Recent advances in optimization of smart structures and actuators. *Journal of Intelligent Material Systems and Structures*, 14(4-5):207–216, 2003.

[12] J. P. Hespanha. *Linear Systems Theory*. Princeton Press, Princeton, New Jersey, Sep. 2009.

[13] C.T. Lin. Structural controllability. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, (3):201–208, 1974.

[14] F. Lin, M. Fardad, and M. R. Jovanović. Algorithms for leader selection in stochastically forced consensus networks. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 59(7):1789–1802, July 2014.

[15] J. Munkres. Algorithms for the assignment and transportation problems. *Journal of the Society of Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 5(1):32 – 38, March 1957.

[16] K. Murota. *Matrices and Matroids for Systems Analysis*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 1st edition, 2009.

[17] A. Olshevsky. Minimal controllability problems. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 1(3):249–258, Sept 2014.

[18] A. Olshevsky. Minimum input selection for structural controllability. *ArXiv e-prints*, July 2014.

[19] S. L. Padula and R. K. Kincaid. Optimization strategies for sensor and actuator placement. Technical report, National Aeronautics and Space Administration Langley Research Center, Langley, Virginia 23681, 1999.

[20] F. Pasqualetti, S. Zampieri, and F. Bullo. Controllability metrics, limitations and algorithms for complex networks. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 1(1):40–52, March 2014.

[21] S. Pequito, S. Kar, and A. P. Aguiar. A framework for structural input/output and control configuration selection of large-scale systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control. Conditionally Accepted as a Regular Paper, Nov. 2014. Initial Submission: Sept. 2013. Revised: Sept. 2014.*

[22] S. Pequito, S. Kar, and A. P. Aguiar. Minimum cost input-output and control configuration selection: A structural systems approach. In *Proceedings of IEEE 52nd Annual Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 4895–4900, Dec 2013.

[23] S. Pequito, S. Kar, and A. P. Aguiar. On the Complexity of the Constrained Input Selection Problem for Structural Linear Systems. *ArXiv e-prints*, March 2014.

[24] S. Pequito, S. Kar, and A.P. Aguiar. Optimal cost actuator/sensor placement for large scale linear time-invariant systems: A structured systems approach. In *Proceedings of European Control Conference*, pages 815–820, July 2013.

[25] S. Pequito, S. Kar, and A.P. Aguiar. A structured systems approach for optimal actuator-sensor placement in linear time-invariant systems. In *Proceedings of American Control Conference*, pages 6108–6113, June 2013.

[26] G. Ramos, S. Pequito, S. Kar, A. P. Aguiar, and J. Ramos. On the Exact Solution of the Minimal Controllability Problem. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2014.

[27] K. J. Reinschke. *Multivariable control: a graph theoretic approach*, volume 108 of *Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, 1988.

[28] D. D. Siljak. *Large-Scale Dynamic Systems: Stability and Structure*. Dover Publications, 2007.

[29] T. H. Summers, F. L. Cortesi, and J. Lygeros. On Submodularity and Controllability in Complex Dynamical Networks. *ArXiv e-prints*, April 2014.

[30] V. Tzoumas, M. A. Rahimian, G. J. Pappas, and A. Jadbabaie. Minimal Actuator Placement with Bounds on Control Effort. *ArXiv e-prints*, September 2014.